

**From:** bmerdene@yahoo.com  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 12:41 AM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:** Public Comment Form

---

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by  
(bmerdene@yahoo.com) on Sunday, March 21, 2010 at 00:41:26

-----

commenter\_subject: Regulation of Retail Forex  
commenter\_frdate: January 21, 2010  
commenter\_frpage: 3282  
commenter\_comments: I donâ€™t agree with this drastic change in the  
leverage for on-exchange traded currency contracts.  
commenter\_name: Erdenebayar Munkhtogoo  
commenter\_city: Ulaanbaatar  
commenter\_state: Mongolia  
commenter\_zip: 976  
commenter\_phone: 976-99117665

-----

**From:** Joe Hall <jdhall111@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 1:02 AM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:** Proposed Leverage Change

---

I voice NO to the proposed leverage changes for retail forex traders.

The proposed leverage change for retail customers of forex trading is by no means necessary.

Thank you.

**From:** Ryan O'Keefe <ryan@ryanokeefe.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 1:58 AM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:** Regulation of Retail Forex

---

David Stawick  
Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission  
1155 21<sup>st</sup> Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20581

Regarding: RIN 3038-AC61

Dear Mr. Stawick,

I am writing to voice my position on the CFTC's proposed regulations for off-exchange retail foreign exchange transactions. The proposed regulations offer many consumer protections, and represent a well intentioned plan to regulate what has long been considered the "wild west" of financial markets. Unfortunately I believe some of the proposed regulations will have drastic consequences on the market, and ultimately unravel every consumer protection the CFTC is trying to achieve. Enclosed are my comments on each proposed regulation I believe should not be adopted, or should be modified within Federal Register RIN 3038-AC61.

#### Regulation 5.8 – Aggregate Retail Forex Assets

The proposal to require RFEDs and FCMs to segregate the net credit balance deposited by retail forex customers is well intentioned, but falls short of truly protecting clients funds in a bankruptcy scenario. Segregated accounts offer the only true protection for client funds, as the CFTC points out in this proposed rule. I believe the bankruptcy code should be modified to protect segregated accounts off-exchange as they are on-exchange. Achieving a change in the bankruptcy code would allow the CFTC to enforce real deposit protections by requiring RFEDs and FCMs to segregate client funds. I believe the CFTC should adopt this proposed rule as something is better than nothing, but I'm confident some off-exchange retail clients will misinterpret disclosures related to these capital balances as some form of guaranteed deposit protection.

#### Regulation 5.9 – Security Deposits for Retail Forex Transactions

I am strongly opposed to the maximum 10:1 leverage limit. I understand the CFTC's concern regarding the negative effects of high leverage however; leverage is an essential tool for off-exchange retail currency traders. Traders who understand how to manage the risks of leverage through sound money management should not be limited to 10:1. Limiting leverage will reduce the professional trader's ability to maximize the use of risk capital. On a matter of principal, I do not believe it is the role of government to mandate which tool a professional should be able to use.

The National Futures Association has set leverage limits at 100:1, which had already been adopted as standard operating leverage by most off-exchange currency traders. I believe the 10:1 leverage limit is unnecessary as the congressional record through the Farm Bill never intended for the CFTC to regulate leverage. The intent of the Farm Bill was to bring transparency and oversight to a traditionally unregulated financial market, not to crush the future of the industry limiting its leverage ability. Furthermore, the maximum loss in off-exchange currency trading regardless of leverage is drastically less than the currency futures market. I see little or no benefit to leverage restrictions from a maximum loss perspective. I encourage the CFTC to address its concerns about leverage through trader educational programs, or enhanced

disclosure documentation for off-exchange currency traders.

I also believe the adoption of this rule will invalidate every consumer protection proposed by the CFTC. Many traders have already moved their accounts offshore in response to the NFA's leverage and hedging actions. If the CFTC adopts a 10:1 leverage restriction the majority of U.S. based retail currency accounts will move overseas. Some overseas dealers currently offer leverage higher than 100:1, and operate outside the CFTC's jurisdiction which renders useless any consumer protections offered in the proposed regulations. I believe the adoption of Regulation 5.9 will dramatically affect U.S. based currency dealers by driving many out of business as clients move their accounts overseas. What we are really talking about with Regulation 5.9 is crushing a \$1 billion dollar industry that provides high paying jobs, and tax revenue, for the sake of protecting some traders from their own ignorance. Traders are already properly disclosed on the risks related to trading on high margin. I stand alongside the Forex Dealers Coalition, the IB Coalition and thousands of retail currency traders in staunch opposition to Regulation 5.9.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on these proposed regulations. I sincerely hope the CFTC considers my comments, and the comments it has already received from currency traders around the world opposing Regulation 5.9

Kind Regards,

Ryan O'Keefe  
Carnation, WA  
March 20, 2010

**From:** smorgil@yahoo.com  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 2:27 AM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:** Public Comment Form

---

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by  
(smorgil@yahoo.com) on Sunday, March 21, 2010 at 02:26:36  
-----

commenter\_subject: Regulation of Retail Forex  
commenter\_frdate: January 20, 2010  
commenter\_frpage: 3282  
commenter\_name: Bat-Orgil  
commenter\_address1: smorgil@yahoo.com  
commenter\_city: Ulaanbaatar  
commenter\_state: Tuv  
commenter\_zip: 976  
-----

**From:** smorgil@yahoo.com  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 2:28 AM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:** Public Comment Form

---

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by  
(smorgil@yahoo.com) on Sunday, March 21, 2010 at 02:28:11

-----

commenter\_subject: Regulation of Retail Forex

commenter\_frdate: January 20, 2010

commenter\_frpage: 3282

commenter\_comments: I donâ€™t agree with this drastic change in the  
leverage for on-exchange traded currency contracts.

commenter\_name: BatOrgil

commenter\_address1: smorgil@yahoo.com

commenter\_city: Ulaanbaatar

commenter\_state: Tuv

commenter\_zip: 976

-----

**From:** Stephen Davies <stephen@storman.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 3:49 AM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Cc:** stephen@storman.com  
**Subject:** Regulation of Retail Forex

---

RIN 3038-AC61

From: Stephen Davies in Riverside, CA

We want to continue to be able to use our iPhone trading Application without being restricted to a specific broker. Please do not force a law change on this which will be to the detriment of everyone.

--

This mail was sent via IB Coalition <http://ibcoalition.org/take-action/>

**From:** Svetoslav Stoqnov <stoyanov\_sm@abv.bg>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 5:29 AM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:** 'Regulation of Retail Forex' RIN 3038-AC61

---

Dear US Government. I've recently heard that you intend to decrease leverage of Forex trading for retail traders. Your proposal 10:1 leverage is extremely uncomfortable for the decent US trader. It will minimize the potential profit more than too much. Traders will be forced to transfer their funds in Europe, where this "Ridiculous Nonsense 10:1" is fortunately still unheard.

P.S. I'm Bulgarian citizen but please allow the US Forex traders to trade for God's sake. This is the way for them to pass the Recession.

Have a splendid day!!!!



**From:** 13823195823@139.com  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 5:38 AM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:** about the level of leverage

---

Dear,

I am a client of fxsolutions.  
I think that the current level of leverage is appropriate.  
I dont hope to cut down the level of leverage.

thanks.

Mr. liu  
MM新用户315回馈, 乐享5元话费

**From:** Ashraf Hamdan <ashraf.hamdan@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 6:54 AM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:** Regulation of Retail Forex

---

Dear CFTC,

This proposed legislation that aims to restrict and limit traders' investments is completely hilarious. Investing always comes with risk management. Higher risks often give opportunities for great returns. And limiting the chance to risk will not help average people accumulate high returns. Please don't try to limit our ability to earn extra cash!

Thanks

Ash

RIN 3038-AC61

**From:** Czarina Cleopatra Mendoza <czarina\_cleopatra\_mendoza@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 6:56 AM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:** Regulation of Retail Forex

---

To Whom It May Concern:

I wrote to express my thoughts about the 1:10 maximum leverage proposed rule. The probable result/s of this rule, if passed, could be:

#1 beginner traders would not invest in forex;

#2 beginner traders would still invest in forex but they will not bother to study how the market works because they think 1:10 leverage is protecting their margin and small losses would not kill their account that quick;

#3 traders will open an account somewhere outside the US, where they are allowed to trade more than 1:10 leverage; or worse,

#4 brokers will lose their customers and lead to their business' demise.

Please review this proposal carefully.

Best regards,

Czarina Cleopatra

Code: **RIN 3038-AC61**

**From:** adrian lucida <lucidaadrian@yahoo.ca>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 6:59 AM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:** Regulation of Retail Forex

---

Dear Sir,

Obviously, this proposed rule is beneficial only to big players with lots of capital. This rule doesn't aim to help small and new traders. A 10:1 leverage will just ease the manipulation between the broker and trader accounts. I can see clearly how this rule will ruin small-time traders.

Regards,

Adrian

RIN 3038-AC61

---

Looking for the perfect gift? **[Give the gift of Flickr!](#)**

**From:** Ike Wiley <ikewiley@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 7:27 AM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:** Regulation of Retail FOREX

---

RE: RIN 3038-AC61.

Rules, regulations and laws to protect against scams, etc are one thing, but why must lawmakers and agencies think they must protect an individual from himself? That is the way I look at this, as traders, we are adults and have the right to choose the leverage right for our particular situation. We don't need someone limiting the amount we are willing to risk, if you really want to help the retail trader, stop the brokers from "Stop Hunting" and taking out our trades. Do not reduce leverage, all that will do is force us to find a broker offshore and eventually put the US retail brokers out of business. If that is your true objective, then nothing we say will make a difference.

Isaac Wiley

**From:** James Wright <jameswright56@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 7:55 AM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:** Re: Regulation of Retail Forex...Please Read :)

---

Attention:  
Mr David Stawick,  
Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission,  
1155 21st Street, NW,  
Washington, DC 20581  
Mr Stawick,  
I do not believe the proposed bill RIN 3038-AC61 will be good  
for the people nor for our country (USA).

Please see details in the email below.

James Wright  
Business Owner and Forex Trader  
6027030283

-----  
--- On **Wed, 3/17/10, FX Solutions <email@e.fxolutions.com>** wrote:

From: FX Solutions <email@e.fxolutions.com>  
Subject: Take Action on the Proposed CFTC Regulations  
To: jameswright56@yahoo.com  
Date: Wednesday, March 17, 2010, 2:39 PM

## TAKE ACTION - TIME IS RUNNING OUT!

Recently, the U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) announced that it is seeking public comment on proposed regulations concerning Forex trading.

### WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED CHANGES?

Require retail foreign exchange dealers to limit the leverage available to their retail customers to 10 to 1.  
Below is an example of how the proposed leverage reduction would affect your Forex trading account.

Require all retail Forex industry players, including Introducing Brokers, to register with the CFTC.

Implement a \$20 million minimum net capital standard, with an additional volume-based minimum capital threshold.

### HOW WILL THESE CHANGES AFFECT FOREX TRADERS AND THE AMERICAN ECONOMY?

Should the 10 to 1 leverage rule proposed by the CFTC be adopted:

Funded accounts currently in the U.S. system can be expected to go offshore.

Forex fraud may worsen, not improve. Unregulated dealers from around the world will thrive, while operating without requirements for capital adequacy, risk management models, marketing ethics, dealing practices or even returning of customers funds.

The United States may cost itself millions of dollars in trade revenue.

Thousands of white collar jobs that require an advanced education and range from software developers to accountants to foreign exchange dealers may be eliminated, or move out of the United States.

#### TAKE ACTION!

Please take a moment to submit your comments directly to the CFTC. In order to ensure that your voice is heard, please send your comments to the CFTC by March 22, 2010 and be sure to include "Regulation of Retail Forex" in the subject line and identification number RIN 3038-AC61 in the body of your message.

Email: [secretary@cftc.gov](mailto:secretary@cftc.gov)

Fax: (202) 418-5521

Mail: David Stawick,

Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission,  
1155 21st Street, NW,  
Washington, DC 20581

2010 - FX Solutions, LLC

[Privacy Policy](#) | [Regulation](#) | [Contact Us](#) | [Site Map](#)

The products offered by FX Solutions are leveraged products which carry a high level of risk to your capital with the possibility of losing more than your initial investment and may not be suitable for all investors. Ensure you fully understand the risks involved and seek independent advice if necessary. Depositing more funds and opening more positions increases your risk.

To the best of our ability, FX Solutions believes the information contained herein is accurate and true. We reserve the right to make corrections and/or update the material when deemed necessary. Therefore, FX Solutions assumes no responsibility for errors, inaccuracies or omissions in these materials.

Distributed by: FX Solutions, LLC, Saddle River Executive Centre, One Route 17 South, Suite 260, Saddle River, NJ 07458

This message was sent to: [jameswright56@yahoo.com](mailto:jameswright56@yahoo.com). If you no longer wish to receive emails from FX Solutions, you may [unsubscribe](#) now.

**From:** Rob Schim van der Loeff <rob@sipserver.nl>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 8:32 AM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:** Regulation of Retail Forex

---

I'm about to start investing in foreign currency through a U.S. dealer. I am very concerned about the proposed rules from the CFTC.

Limiting customer trading leverage to 10 to 1 will only increase risk, not decrease it.

My strategy is to have 90% of my capital on a bank account collecting interest, and 10% on a forex trading account.

(forex is still safer than futures, because I can only lose what is in my forex trading account)

By limiting leverage to 10 to 1, I have to put 20 times as much money in my high risk trading account, with the chance to lose it all. Limiting the leverage to 10 to 1 will definitely increase risk, not decrease it.

Reading the rest of the proposed rules, I am convinced that the CFTC is doing good work to make forex trading safer and more transparent.

Please, do not limit the leverage. I would be forced to take my business outside of the United States.

Rob Schim van der Loeff  
Hilversum N/A, 10001  
rob@sipserver.nl



**From:** Baiju <baijusve@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 8:36 AM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Cc:** baijusve@hotmail.com  
**Subject:** Regulation of Retail Forex

---

RIN 3038-AC61

From: Baiju in Mississauga, Ontario

If you can include as many brokers as you can and if we can get free platform on Iphone for any of the brokers listed by you it sounds good.

Baiju

--

This mail was sent via IB Coalition <http://ibcoalition.org/take-action/>

**From:** David Clow <lasergrafix@juno.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 9:08 AM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Cc:** lasergrafix@juno.com  
**Subject:** Regulation of Retail Forex

---

RIN 3038-AC61

From: David Clow in Altamonte Springs, FL

Ref: RIN 3038-AC61

I wish to voice my concern relative to proposed changes that would limit regulated Independent Introducing Brokers (IB's) to working with just a single broker.

I currently used a mobile Forex provider that permits me access to my own Forex broker of choice. Under the proposed choice, I would be forced to change brokers to accommodate mobile trading.

--

This mail was sent via IB Coalition <http://ibcoalition.org/take-action/>

**From:** Rick Hutchings <hutchingsrick@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 9:17 AM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Cc:** hutchingsrick@yahoo.com  
**Subject:** Regulation of Retail Forex

---

RIN 3038-AC61

From: Rick Hutchings in West Palm Beach, Florida

Independent Introducing Brokers (IB's) should NOT be forced to be guaranteed by a single broker.

--

This mail was sent via IB Coalition <http://ibcoalition.org/take-action/>

**From:** Shirley Singleton <xaun@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 10:14 AM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Cc:** xaun@aol.com  
**Subject:** Regulation of Retail Forex

---

RIN 3038-AC61

From: Shirley Singleton in Jacksonville, FL

My trading practices have been significantly hindered by laws that have recently been in place and these will just limit my options even more. Making these kinds of changes will just drive small investors offshore, with even more money leaving leaving the US economy. Leave FOREX trading alone.

--

This mail was sent via IB Coalition <http://ibcoalition.org/take-action/>

**From:** Joe Wojtowicz <jtwojo@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 10:18 AM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Cc:** jtwojo@gmail.com  
**Subject:** Regulation of Retail Forex

---

RIN 3038-AC61

From: Joe Wojtowicz in Austintown, OH

I am strongly against one of your proposed changes that would limit regulated Independent Introducing Forex Brokers to working with just a single Forex broker.

I strongly urge you to reconsider. I am also against the 10:1 leverage proposal.

--

This mail was sent via IB Coalition <http://ibcoalition.org/take-action/>

**From:** Fabiola Carrillo Rodriguez <dysac@live.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 10:35 AM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:** "Regulation of Retail Forex"

---

To David Stawick,  
Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission:

I do not understand the extraregulation at leverage to 10:1 you proposed. that kind of situation may affect the forex trader only for a global elite, only affect the traders that can not have counts of hundred thousands dollars, this regulation is retrograde and is not a good solution for this economic situation. The past year you change the limit at leverage for a good reason, but the leverage limit to 10:1 is excessive and affects not only the mini traders but also brokers and the possibility of future expansion of this market.

Sincerely  
RIN 3038-AC61  
Fabiola Carrillo

---

En Messenger están mis contactos con los que sí tengo contacto

**From:** Stephenie Demaree <jcasteph@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 10:43 AM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Cc:** jcasteph@aol.com  
**Subject:** Regulation of Retail Forex

---

RIN 3038-AC61

From: Stephenie Demaree in Raleigh, NC

Please do not restrict introducing brokers to one broker dealer. Thank you.

--

This mail was sent via IB Coalition <http://ibcoalition.org/take-action/>

**From:** Bryant and Beverley Sewall <wsewall@verizon.net>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 11:37 AM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:** Fw: Regulation of Retail Forex

---

Mr. David Stawick  
Commodity Futures Trading Commission

Dear Mr. Stawick, reference RIN 3038-AC61

I am a retired person making a supplement to my meager retirement income by making small FOREX trades through Trade Station, Inc. via the internet.

Changing the leverage provisions from 100:1 to 10:1 will stop my trading completely as I will not be able to fund an account. I am sure there are thousands of people like me that trade these small accounts for income supplementation that this proposed rule change will shut down. I can see no reason to change a system that is working for one that will not, destroying the income of many, many small traders.

This change will drive the entire industry to foreign markets and foreign brokers outside your realm and open up many avenues for fraud that do not now exist.

Please consider the unintended consequences carefully before your action destroys the U.S. trading industry.

Thank you for your attention to this plea.

Cdr. William Bryant Sewall, US Navy, Retired

Plano, Texas  
wsewall@Verizon.net



**From:** uncleron1 <uncleron1@juno.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 11:45 AM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:** 'Regulation of Retail Forex'

---

Dear Sirs, I'm writing today as Congress votes on a supposed Health Care Package, but we all know 80% of surveyed citizens are opposed to this bill. It's the other garbage included in this bill that most are against, not health care. In response to further government lack of listening, I'm addressing **RIN 3038-AC61**. Forex trading is my lively hood and my families dependence. I am opposed to further govenment meddling with the free markets. The proposed 10:1 leverage is just another way of further weakening our economy. I've already moved my operations off shore due to the negative attitude of this administration to the free enterprise and free market system that has made this country what it is, not socialism or communism like the current democratic congress leaders and the president and his czars, but Capitalism. One needs to only look at other socialist countries in Europe to see where it leads. Portugal, Ireland, Italy, Greece, and Spain are about to go bankrupt due to their spend more than they can tax socialist programs. If this bill is inacted, count on major moves out of the US economy of major foreign investors, why would they even want to invest here. Forex trades a trillion dollars a day globally and is a major force. The idea that the government is going to continue its path of nationalization of our banks, car companies, and financial investment firms is a formula for destruction. I'm already building my portfolio for the US dollar collapse and I will protect myself from the destructive path you are on. Just wanted to voice my opinion before it's too late for the rest of you who are not preparing yourself financially for the consequences. Sincerely, Ron Belt

**From:** Gary Pastor <ggpastor@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 11:50 AM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:** Regulation of Retail Forex

---

I hereby register my opposition to proposed regulation that reduces the current leverage available to forex traders. This regulation will only serve to protect traders from themselves by effectively destroying the retail Forex Industry. Traders do not need protection from themselves. Brokerages go above and beyond in their efforts to advise of the risk involved in currency trading on all correspondence and web material. Education is available everywhere for free, and from Brokers at minimal cost, so there is no excuse for a trader to be uniformed as to the risk involved.

The CFTC should be focusing on protecting traders from brokerage houses that are in danger of collapse. Work to protect deposits like the FDIC, so we don't risk losing our accounts. Destroying the retail market with these margin requirements will push a lot of people off-shore, and into the huge risks involved with unregulated foreign operations, ultimately causing more damage than it prevents. Having no insurance in the main reason I have not placed more funds in my brokerage account.

G. Pastor  
Toronto Canada.

**From:** Paiboon Langlongstit <freecash2004@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 11:53 AM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:** The 10:1 leverage limitation

---

Dear Sir/Madam,

I had been trading with 200:1 level since 2000 in the forex market for living.

Until now, the world economics are going to unstable and I have hard time to make a living in USA with 100:1 level on forex market and I am planing to move my fund aboard in the near future if it is necessary.

Yours Sincerely,  
Paiboon Langlongstit

**From:** Ed Ethredge <wt4xmepips@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 11:56 AM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Cc:** cftcfeedback@fxdd.com  
**Subject:** Regulation of Retail Forex

---

RIN 3038-AC61

Mr. Stawick:

I hope that all is well with you. I am writing to you about the proposed Regulation of Retail Forex changes. I suspect that your mail and email are getting somewhat inundated. I will keep this brief. Should this particular Regulation be allowed to pass, it would affect a good deal of smaller traders who otherwise might not be able to have a dream of someday becoming more financially less dependent on the government and others for day to day living. One of the reasons that I, for one, got involved in forex trading IS for the lack of a more intense financial commitment. I do not come from a family with a lot of financial resources. That does NOT mean, however, that I have less of a desire to achieve certain things. Trading at the level that I currently have available to me has allowed me to gain a certain bit of financial intelligence. Maybe allowing those with less financial means to be able to trade as we currently have the ability to do will result in more of us having the ability to not only be less dependent on the government for retirement, it might also mean that we could help others achieve some of their financial goals as well. Both Donald Trump and Robert Kiyosaki wrote a book about why they'd like others to become "Rich". I think that it's partly because if one is not a part of the "solution", so to speak, one becomes a part of the "problem", simply by default.

I'm not trying to insinuate that allowing the current leverage will be the end all solution. I'm suggesting that allowing the current leverage will allow more people to take part in becoming active in increasing their own financial intelligence and therefore allow more people to effectively increase their own means and possibly help others to be able to accomplish the same.

Thank you for the opportunity to voice my opinion.

Ed Ethredge,

Forex Trader, Philadelphia, PA

**From:** Howard <hsmit64@ymail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 12:07 PM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Cc:** hsmit64@ymail.com  
**Subject:** Regulation of Retail Forex

---

RIN 3038-AC61

From: Howard in Camarillo, California

Independent IB's should not be forced to be guaranteed by a single broker, this makes no sense as to achieving any regulation that seeks to protect

the consumer.

--

This mail was sent via IB Coalition <http://ibcoalition.org/take-action/>

**From:** marc t <marcvoi@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 12:55 PM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:** number RIN 3038-AC61 Regulation of Retail Forex

---

**NEW margin rule will hurt Americans like myself**

Should the 10 to 1 leverage rule proposed by the CFTC be adopted:

Funded accounts currently in the U.S. system can be expected to go offshore.

Forex fraud may worsen, not improve. Unregulated dealers from around the world will thrive, while operating without requirements for capital adequacy, risk management models, marketing ethics, dealing practices or even returning of customers funds.

The United States may cost itself millions of dollars in trade revenue.

Thousands of white collar jobs that require an advanced education and range from software developers to accountants to foreign exchange dealers may be eliminated, or move out of the United States.

**From:** Peter von Laudermann <pvonl@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 1:10 PM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:** Regulation of Retail Forex

---

Dear Mr. Stawick,

I am writing to you in regards of the proposed reduction of leverage from 100:1 to 10:1 as put forth in article number RIN 3038-AC61. I feel that this proposed lower leverage would more likely affect individual retail traders such as myself, rather than larger trading firms with millions of dollars to invest. This may hamper my, along with other traders with small accounts, ability to take advantage of all the great profitable opportunities that the Forex market has to offer. These changes may cause many traders to move their accounts offshore, which will result in the U.S. losing trading revenue. I know that I will be considering that option.

I don't believe that placing more regulations and restrictions on the Retail Forex market will solve any problems. If anything, these changes may do more harm than good for this country. We are in this financial mess because of corporate greed and the skewed, corrupt political agendas of our nation's leaders, not because of traders who are trying to make an honest income, or supplemental income, through trading. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,  
Peter von Laudermann

**From:** Eduardas Smilga <sed351@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 1:27 PM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Cc:** sed351@yahoo.com  
**Subject:** Regulation of Retail Forex

---

RIN 3038-AC61  
From: Eduardas Smilga in Klaipeda, Lithuania

--  
This mail was sent via IB Coalition <http://ibcoalition.org/take-action/>



**From:** Patrick Buttermark <patrickbuttermark@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 1:31 PM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:** regulation of retail forex

---

RIN3038\_AC61

Dear sir/madam

I'm writing to voice my strong objection to your proposal to limit leverage in retail forex to 10:1. I'll keep this as short as possible as not to waste too much of your or my time because we all know that "proposal" means it's going to be done and the will of the people be damned. I personally would not use 400:1 leverage but the government has no business telling me how to invest my money. My finances are in good order, not since Andrew Jackson was president has the U.S. government been able to say the same ( Andrew Jackson is the only president to pay off the national debt)

This "proposal" benefits no one, except of course if there's lobbying for this. Limiting leverage protects no one, in any financial market a fool and their money will always be parted. If that fool can't use 400:1 leverage in forex, then that fool will loose their money in some nonsense penny stock or ponzi scheme.

In as far as the people that loose their money and then cry that they've been taken advantage of - I,m sure there are some schemers and disreputable brokers out there, but there are too many people that treat forex like gambling. I myself have little more than an 8th grade education and a GED diploma BUT I took the time and put in the effort to learn proper money/ risk management and fundamental/technical analysis as a result I have far more profitable trades than losers. There's no reason anyone else can't do the same.

If you really want to help people out and protect people ( which is why your agency exists) why not implement some sort of test people have to take to open a forex account nothing that requires an MBA degree just something that makes sure people opening a new account understand leverage, spreads etc. Also so many people get suckered into these "robots" that loose more money than they make. No ones doing anything about that

Last year it was hedging, this year it's leverage- what next? Prohibiting stop losses?

Too many peoples jobs and livelihoods are at stake . During the depression they enacted prohibition, do you think all those brewers and related workers suddenly not having a job helped the economy? Should, god forbid, this "proposal" come to be, Josef Stalin, Vladimir Lennon and Karl Marx will all smile upon your agency whilst the founding fathers of this country roll over in their graves.

sincerely

Patrick Buttermark

Staten Island, N.Y.

patrickbuttermark@yahoo.com

**From:** Dennis Weldy <mrdkweldy48@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 1:40 PM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:** Regulation of Retail Forex

---

Dear Mr. Secretary,

Please keep the Maximum Leverage under the current regulations for retail forex customers at 100:1. Do not change it to the proposed ratio of 10:1 (RIN 3038-AC61) which would make the U.S. retail forex market highly uncompetitive with that of the Canadian and United Kingdom retail forex markets. Why would your office want to do that to the U. S. retail forex market (customers)? Again, Please DO NOT change the current margin requirements. Thank you.

Sincerely

Dennis K. Weldy  
19557 Lacey Lane East  
Bristol, IN 46507  
[Mrdkweldy48@yahoo.com](mailto:Mrdkweldy48@yahoo.com)

**From:** James Ahlich <jmahli@adelphia.net>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 1:52 PM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:** leverage reduction

---

While lowering the leverage in the fx is proposed to help the consumer, I am suspicious of the motive. Leave it alone. I'm not going to go to futures or the stock market if you lower the leverage.  
jahlich, small time fx trader/beginner

**From:** Robert KNIGHTON <robert-carolyn@sbcglobal.net>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 1:55 PM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:**

---

Do no change the leverage of the forex

**From:** Steve McMannis <smcmannis3@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 2:34 PM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:** Regulation of Retail Forex

---

To Whom It May Concern,

**RIN 3038-AC61**

I am writing to you at the CFTC today in regards to the proposed leverage changes. On which I would like to be clear that I am against, though can understand the reasons for the proposed changes.

First I would like to address the CFTC's loss of original purpose in attempting to regulate leverage. According to [cftc.gov](http://cftc.gov) "Today, the CFTC assures the economic utility of the futures markets by encouraging their competitiveness and efficiency, protecting market participants against fraud, manipulation, and abusive trading practices, and by ensuring the financial integrity of the clearing process. Through effective oversight, the CFTC enables the futures markets to serve the important function of providing a means for price discovery and offsetting price risk. "

In no way, is limiting leverage a facility of any of those, and in fact places good retail traders at a significant disadvantage. In fact, I could not at this point, nor want to trade forex because the profit potential would be unsubstantial in relation to my current account size. Any regulations by the CFTC would make Forex trading an even more major bank and institution solo game. Trading, as I have found out, the hard way over the past 12 months is all about risk/reward and rather than limiting leverage for every one in the industry, the CFTC in my opinion would be better served in educating participants about risk management.

I hold a Series 3 license and as also as a Student understand the difficulty of trading in the Forex market, yet any of your proposed changes would just make it more so. Possible accomplishments might include less blown accounts but at the same time disable an entire set of independent traders.

Regards,

--

Steve McMannis  
BS Industrial Engineering 2012  
University of Pittsburgh

[smcmannis3@gmail.com](mailto:smcmannis3@gmail.com) | 724.594.3569

**From:** gamfreek1989@aol.com  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 2:48 PM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:** Regulation of Retail Forex

---

RIN 3038-AC61

Mr. Stawick, proposing leverage regulations on the retail forex industry is one of those situations where "good intentions paved the road to hell." From your viewpoint, reducing leverage will protect the US client from financial harm. That's cool, but if you look at the forest and not just the trees, you would see that this regulations will drive many brokers and traders alike out of business. This regulation will send an abundance of jobs and money out of this country. If you can't already tell this country's economic situation isn't getting better and to do this would make it even worse. You are not protecting traders with this regulation, because the investors and traders who practice sound money management don't need a law to do so. If this is really about investors and traders, then you would do us a favor and not touch our leverage? As stated before it is the individual investor/traders decision on how much risk to take on any given trade, not anyone else's.

Thank you,

Lou

**From:** Lynn House <rlhouse2@sbcglobal.net>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 3:45 PM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:** Regulation of Retail Forex

---

I would like to vote NO for the proposed changes.

**From:** Sergey Goryunov <sergey.goryunov@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 3:46 PM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Cc:** sergey.goryunov@gmail.com  
**Subject:** Regulation of Retail Forex

---

RIN 3038-AC61

From: Sergey Goryunov in Moscow, Russia

Independent IB's should not be forced to be guaranteed by a single broker.

--

This mail was sent via IB Coalition <http://ibcoalition.org/take-action/>



**From:** Tim Considine <tim.considine@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 4:17 PM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Cc:** tim.considine@gmail.com  
**Subject:** Regulation of Retail Forex

---

RIN 3038-AC61

From: Tim Considine in Winchester, Hampshire

Please review your proposed legislation to restrict IIB to one firm.

I believe this will limit market competition and do nothing to protect traders.

If anything, the reduction in choice will make it more difficult for private traders

Thank you.

--

This mail was sent via IB Coalition <http://ibcoalition.org/take-action/>

**From:** asitpatel15@gmail.com on behalf of  
Asit Patel <asitpatel@tds.net>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 4:24 PM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Cc:** cftcfeedback@fxdd.com  
**Subject:** Regulation of Retail Forex - RIN 3038-AC61

---

David Stawick,  
Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission,

Please do not pass the new Regulation of Retail Forex, RIN 3038-AC61. As you are aware, this will force most US Forex Funded Accounts offshore to unregulated dealers. Not a good thing. I know I will open some accounts offshore, however I would much prefer staying in the US. I just cannot see how this will help the US and the white collar US jobs supporting this industry. I will Leave All US brokers to avoid this new rule if it is passed. Thank you for your time.  
Kind Regards

Asit Patel

**From:** vsmart <vsmart@earthlink.net>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 4:36 PM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Cc:** 'Cliff Copeland' <idealc36@yahoo.com>; 'Lucky Manning' <Gemcare44@aol.com>; 'Joseph Miller' <jmiller@caribbeanchoice.com>  
**Subject:** REGULATION OF RETAIL FOREX

---

Dear Sir/Madam:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to "Regulation of Off-Exchange Retail Foreign Exchange Transactions and Commodity Pools." As a retail Forex Trader, I find this proposed regulation of 10-1 leverage very discriminatory. Once again, the small investors are being squeezed, while the Institutional Investors that already control our money stand to reap even more benefits.

It is my strong belief that the United States are turning back the hands of time while other places such as the UK are moving way ahead by offering retail investors up to 200-1 leverage. I urge that you reconsider this proposal by keeping the current 100-1 leverage intact. Thanks for your consideration.

Have an awesome Day!

Very truly yours,

*Vittel Smart*  
**407-814-1161**

**From:** dantebella@tx.rr.com  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 4:43 PM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:** Regulation of Retail Forex

---

To whom it may concern,

I appreciate your time in advance. I am writing to comment about the recent proposal (RIN 3038-AC61) to decrease the amount of leverage available to retail Forex traders. I do recognize the larger concern here, and the obvious effects of over leveraged accounts across multiple asset classes in the past few years.

I believe that one of the main spirits in our country is speculation with risk. There is no point in history where this has not been a main factor in our success. People no the risks, they just ignore them due to ignorance and lack of skill. I believe that the Forex brokers are doing an excellent job by offering comprehensive education as well as ample warning(s) of the RISKS involved with Forex trading.

If you take big risks you can have big losses, but you do not have to take big risks with high leverage. With proper education and money management (skill) you can avoid this cycle. I think that 50:1 leverage is more than enough for any trader and would be a good compromise. I am new to this market and a small trader, if 10:1 is the only thing available I cannot trade in this market; it's that simple. I apologize in advance for any responses that have arrived based on anger or misunderstanding instead of the spirit of dialogue. Thanks again

**From:** Louie Lewis <ehseagles07@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 4:50 PM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:**

---

RIN 3038-AC61

To whom this may concern,

I've done my research on the proposed regulations set forth by the CFTC. While I admit the I do support and condone most of the wanted regulations, the only one that troubles me is Regulation 5.9. Most of the regulations actually help move this industry foward, but If 5.9 is implemented it would destroy any potential for Forex to grow. Some of the proposed regulations help with keeping dealers honest but what good would that do if they are bankrupt from clients moving accounts offshore. If anything 5.9 could single handedly demolish forex for the United States. Not to mention, the large amounts of jobs that would be lost and the amounts of money and business that would sent to other economies when we so clearly need them here. Even if 5.9 is implemented, traders will get leverage from overseas brokers leaving no business at all to regulate here in the states. I feel we can regulate this industry without having to mess with leverage. The futures market

has all sorts of regulations but they still have multiple amounts of leverage offered. Why can't the same be done for FX? For my last point, there is nothing in the congressional record that supports any involvement with changing leverage, so why mess with it? As stated before, as a trader, I support most of the proposed regulations but I cannot support this one because it serves no purpose but to destroy a profitable and flourishing industry in this country.

**From:** Sue and Guy <peace@gwtc.net>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 3:55 PM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:** Regulation of Retail Forex

---

March 21, 2010

From: Guy D. Aul  
28123 Waters Edge  
Hot Springs, SD 57747  
Phone/Fax: 605-745-3217  
Email: peace@gwtc.net

To: CFTC

Re: RIN 3038-AC61  
Regulation of Retail Forex

Without going into a long discussion about the pros and cons of the recent discussions concerning the change in leverage from 100:1 to 10:1 for retail forex trading, I continue to feel that the leverage ratio should remain at 100:1.

Best Regards,

Guy D. Aul

**From:** David Fernandez <davefernd@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 5:48 PM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:** Regulation of Retail Forex

---

To whom it may concern,

Please DO NOT reduce the current leverage rate available to forex traders from 100:1 to 10:1.

I understand that your intention is to protect the layman, but you are in fact crippling everyone's freedom to choose how to invest their money and the level of risk they are willing to take. The key word here is "FREEDOM"!

Almost all funds, I believe, are now required to disclose how risky trading in futures and currencies is, with statements such as "you may lose all or more of your initial investment". What part of that statement do people don't get? They are just looking to blame their losses (and their own stupidity) on somebody other than themselves. This prompts government agencies to step in so that these people don't complain anymore usually with the effect of hurting more than helping.

I personally don't think it is fair to cap the leverage rate. In fact, most forex brokers offer mini accounts that people not willing to risk a lot can use. Also, brokers allow you to choose from different leverage rates in order to increase or decrease your own risk.

So why should everyone be penalized for other's mistakes?  
I have faith you will make the right decision.

David Fernandez.

**From:** Regina Edwards <regina.edwards@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 6:05 PM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Cc:** regina.edwards@yahoo.com  
**Subject:** Regulation of Retail Forex

---

RIN 3038-AC61

From: Regina Edwards in magnolia, MA

The CFTC should not change the rules regarding IB's. Forcing an IB to be guaranteed will hurt traders that rely on an independent perspective to choose their broker platform. this is a valuable service that helps the industry and traders.

IB's that introduce to futures brokers do not have this restriction. The CFTC expects consistency from the industry it regulates. It should offer the same consistency in the regulations its proposes.

--

This mail was sent via IB Coalition <http://ibcoalition.org/take-action/>



**From:** Sterling Suhr <sterlingsuhr@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 6:20 PM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Cc:** sterlingsuhr@gmail.com  
**Subject:** Regulation of Retail Forex

---

RIN 3038-AC61

From: Sterling Suhr in South Haven, MI

Hi, my name is Sterling. I look at the health care bill and I look at this and while completely seperate in nature the trend scares me. Governing agencies are there to represent the people not make decisions for them. This will not slove any problems only create them. Brokers in the US will close because of traders going to overseas brokers to maintain the same leverage. So whats next is there going to be a ban on US citizens signing up with overseas brokers. The principal behind this is wise and proper money management is a good thing but we should have the choice without someone telling us what leverage we can use. I hope this does not go through, I hope that the government agency set in place to represent the people actually listens to the emails your getting and doesnt pass this.

-Sterling

--

This mail was sent via IB Coalition <http://ibcoalition.org/take-action/>

**From:** Kent McDaniel <kentmcdaniel123@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 6:26 PM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:** Regulation of retail forex

---

To who it my concern I trade the mini forex market with \$500 account I have all ready made a small profit. I feel that 100:1 leverage should stay the same as my margin is sufficient to cover any losses and I am able to set stops to control my losses. Trading is my dream but if regulation Rin 3038-AC61 is imposed I will not have the capital to trade. I do not at this time trade any more than one lot so I don't over leverage myself. Please do not change it to 10:1 as I feel that it would have a negative affect on U.S traders. Thank You And again a 10:1 leverage would knock me out of the game.

**From:** Jesus Castano <arnaldo\_55@live.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 6:33 PM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:** Regulation Retail forex

---

*I am a forex small investor and I strongly  
oppose the proposed leverage change  
from 100:1 to 10:1*

*Jesus A Castano*

---

Hotmail: Trusted email with powerful SPAM protection. [Sign up now.](#)

**From:** Rick reay <rickreay@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 6:33 PM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:** Regulation of retail forex

---

I believe that 10:1 proposed

Stay in touch. [Get Messenger on your phone now.](#)

**From:** Larry Johns <kentlarr@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 6:56 PM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:** Regulation of Retail Forex

---

I am writing in regards to RIN 3038-AC61, and to the proposed reduction of margin in trading the retail forex market.

I am 62 years old, single, and I have a limited source of income from Social Security. I trade the retail forex market to pay for my monthly expenses and future savings.

I trade with a \$50,000 account at InterbankFX, and I use a maximum of trading 1% for all daily positions. Using the current allowed leverage of 100:1 enables me to trade successfully and to pay my monthly expenses while saving for the future.

If the leverage were to be reduced to any less amount, I would have to use much more of my account, and I would not be able to trade within resonable risk parameters.

I do not desire to move my trading business to an overseas account. I am asking that you keep the current margin limits of 100:1 as has already been set by the NFA. Any change would make it impossible for me to trade and make enough money to provide for my living expenses.

Larry Johns

My address is P.O. Box 11147, San Bernardino, California, 92423, and my telephone number is 909-659-2126.

**From:** Franz Holzmann <franman@telus.net>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 7:02 PM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:** Reduction of leverage

---

Gentlemen / Ladies.

I strongly object to your proposed lowering of leverage. I believe this to be a free choice anyone should be able to make personally. Regulations are, in my opinion not going to save anyone.

Thank you

Franz Holzmann

**From:** Gary Pysz <pysz@bellsouth.net>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 7:03 PM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:** Regulation of Retail Forex

---

Hello. I am writing this email to express my opinion on any proposed Forex regulation that would increase margin requirements beyond 100:1 leverage.

(identification number RIN 3038-AC61)

It is my opinion that 100:1 leverage is sufficient and anything tighter than that, like 10:1, is unnecessary and may even be harmful to small, individual Forex traders such as myself.

thank you,  
Gary Pysz

**From:** Cthurz@aol.com  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 7:16 PM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:** "Regulation of Retail Forex": RIN 3038-AC61

---

To the Secretary of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, subject " Regulation of Retail Forex": RIN 3038-AC61. Hello David Stawick, I can't believe your looking for a Fight!, while the economy is in its current state? Your trying to disrupt the retail Forex market place in one manor or another and now make if exclusive to large banks, corporations, groups and the wealthy. People have invested large amounts of their time and or money to learn Forex Trading. The Forex has a benefit of trading with small amounts of money due to leverage and minimum margin. I use a broker that has a maximum leverage of 50:1 which I find just right and use only 2% of my portfolio per trade with proper risk management. I've spent all my free time for years to learn about the Forex trading, technical analysis, Japanese candlesticks, fibonacci, so many indicators, so many Books, DVD's, Seminars, group coaching, etc. The learning of various Forex broker platforms, demo accounts, etc. You want to require large sums of money for margin requirements! You basically want to prevent anyone other than a select few from benefitting from the Forex market place. I'm about to retire and use the Forex market to supplement my income. If I can't trade in the United States then I'll trade off shore! Should you stop off shore trading within the United States!!!! I AM SO PISSED OFF!!!! I'm ready for the next REVOLUTION!!!



**From:** akihiro sekine <akh60000@i.softbank.jp>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 7:19 PM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Cc:** akh60000@i.softbank.jp  
**Subject:** Regulation of Retail Forex

---

RIN 3038-AC61

From: akihiro sekine in kanagawa , japan, kawasaki

--

This mail was sent via IB Coalition <http://ibcoalition.org/take-action/>

**From:** Derek J. <djlw18@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 7:36 PM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:** Regulation of Retail Forex

---

To whom it may concern:

In lieu of mathematical details, I shall tell you exactly how I feel and spare you any technical repetition I'm sure you've heard over and over again. How limiting leverage to 10:1 is going to kill retail traders. How this new regulation will indeed have the exact adverse effect of your intent. You think you're helping, but you are not. I do not need my hand held. I do not need intervention, nor does anyone else. If people fail to educate themselves, that is their own problem. You do not have the right (or shall I say, "you should not have the right") to punish those of us who have worked hard to get where we are at, which in essence is exactly what you're doing. I'm not going to tell you how backwards your logic (or lack thereof) is, requiring people to put up more margin is not going to save their tails; it's going to make them lose it - even quicker than before.

I'm not going to tell you how very angry the fact this is even being proposed makes me. Nor am I going to tell you of all the means being researched to stop this. Neither am I going to tell you how many people from traders to brokers stand strongly against this, as I'm sure you've received an outpouring of outcries out of the woodwork.

No, I'm not going to inform you that this should be a classic case of leaving well enough alone.

Neither am I going to inform you, I'm just fine with regulation - but overt regulation really irks me to no end. We don't need a reminder of your powers, nor do you need to "regulate" just to have something to do - and go down in history, negatively.

No, I'm not going to tell you how much you're hurting the little guy and helping the fat cats with this. Nor am I going to rant about how middle class Americans are getting screwed once again, as they seem to always get the short end of the stick for some reason. Why do law-abiding citizens, who do no harm to anyone, work hard to earn an honest buck, pay their taxes, properly insure themselves and do just about everything they can the right way - get treated so horribly?

And no, I'm definitely not going to accuse you of trying to drive traders over to futures - lord knows you wouldn't want that. Would you? And I'm SURE you dislike the fact you're going to drive more jobs out of America with this awfully ingenious move?

What I will do is end on this note and send it to you just before deadline, in hopes you're actually reading these strong shared sentiments and taking them under strong consideration. This proposal should be burned and never brought up again, what do you say? Let's just forget this ever happened, and we'll let you over-regulators off the hook, and we can all live happily ever after in a 100:1 world. Haven't you taken enough away from us already? FIFO - nonsense, anti-hedging - garbage.

Should you go through with this, I leave you with these last words: with the American dream slowly dying, I hope you can rest easy in knowing the role you're playing in its demise.

Sincerely,  
Your Wake Up Call

**From:** David <dbeardain@sbcglobal.net>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 7:56 PM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Cc:** cftcfeedback@fxdd.com  
**Subject:** 'Regulation of Retail Forex' RIN 3038-AC61

---

Dear Sir,

I have over the years I have lived seen where government has put new regulations in place on several different things and late found that it was a wrong way to go.

With this new regulation you are trying to put in place you will be hurting both the little guy trying to make a little more money, if he understands the system or not, and in the long run hurt the government because of the extra taxes they will be able to collect from the extra money they do make. Please do not put into place these new regulations you have come up with.

Thanks,

David Beardain

**From:** Greg Bridgewater <gbridgewater@sbcglobal.net>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 8:22 PM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Cc:** cftcfeedback@fxdd.com  
**Subject:** 'Regulation of Retail Forex'

---

Re: RIN 3038-AC61

**Please do not change the leverage rules that are now in effect, by reducing the leverage. I object to the reduction in leverage.**

Thanks,  
Greg Bridgewater

**From:** tn524@speakeasy.net  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 8:42 PM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:** Regulation of Retail Forex

---

To whom it may concerns:

I would like to express my strong opposition to the proposed leverage change.

Sincerely,

**From:** John Russo <russojohhnt@att.net>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 8:44 PM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:** Regulation of Retail Forex

---

I'm an investor in foreign currency through a U.S. dealer. I am very concerned about the proposed rules from the CFTC. The CFTC's recent ruleproposal, which would limit customer trading leverage to 10 to 1, would be a crippling blow to the U.S. forex industry. This unsustainable rule would drive U.S. forex dealers, which brings tens of millions of dollars into the U.S. banking industry each day, offshore into the hands of foreign competitors. It would encourage fraud both at home and abroad as customers seeking to trade retail forex would have no other legitimate domestic alternative. As an investor, I would be forced to take my business outside of the United States.

John Russo  
New Hartford CT, 06057  
russojohhnt@att.net

**From:** rena106@netscape.net  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 8:52 PM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:** Regulation of Retail Forex

---

**RIN 3038-AC61**

As someone trying to make a living after having been laid off over a year ago, please don't reduce the leverage any further than it is, or only the rich will be able to trade.



**From:** MICHAEL GIBSON <michaelg46@msn.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 9:07 PM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:**

---

I'm definitely opposed to changing the leverage from 100:1 to 10:1. This proposed change will make US currency brokers less competitive with the UK and other foreign brokerages. Please don't let this happen. if you do you will see an exodus of money out of the USA. Is this what you want?

Michael Gibson

From: herling@tom.com  
Sent: Sunday, March 21, 2010 9:14 PM  
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
Subject: Regulation of Retail Forex

---

identification number RIN 3038-AC61

I am a chinese forex trader,if require retail foreign exchange dealers to limit the leverage available to your retail customers to 10 to 1,I will move out of the United States.

**From:** byambaa@eaminerals.com  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 9:21 PM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:** Public Comment Form

---

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by  
(byambaa@eaminerals.com) on Sunday, March 21, 2010 at 21:21:03

-----

commenter\_subject: Regulation of Retail Forex

commenter\_frdate: January 20, 2010

commenter\_frpage: 3282

commenter\_comments: I donâ€™t agree with this drastic change in the  
leverage for on-exchange traded currency contracts.

commenter\_name: Batsaikhan Byambaa

commenter\_address1: bats\_78@yahoo.com

commenter\_address2: Mongolia

commenter\_city: Ulaanbaatar

commenter\_zip: 976

commenter\_fax: 976-11-328655

commenter\_phone: 976-11-328120

-----

**From:** Barry Battista <b.battista@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 9:26 PM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Cc:** b.battista@comcast.net  
**Subject:** Regulation of Retail Forex

---

RIN 3038-AC61

From: Barry Battista in Mechanicsville, Virginia

I do not see the sense in limiting an IB to a single broker. This would run many IBs out of business and put limits on new applications that are now coming out (like trading Forex from an iPhone for example) while doing nothing to protect end users. I hope you abandon this idea.

--

This mail was sent via IB Coalition <http://ibcoalition.org/take-action/>

**From:** Brad Stebbing <brad.stebbing@bdo.com.au>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 9:35 PM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Cc:** brad.stebbing@bdo.com.au  
**Subject:** Regulation of Retail Forex

---

RIN 3038-AC61

From: Brad Stebbing in Melbourne, Victoria

This regulation is unfair and should not be implemented

--

This mail was sent via IB Coalition <http://ibcoalition.org/take-action/>

**From:** Net Cruiser <netcruiser52@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 9:51 PM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:** Regulation of Retail Forex

---

21 March 2010

Dear Sirs,

As regards your involvement in the 'Regulation of Retail Forex' via RIN 3038-AC61.

In 2009 I was paying my bills and getting on pretty well toward having a semi-retirement plan, (up until May 2009 -that is) by trading in the retail Forex market. Since then with the implementation of the regulations you put in to protect us, my debt load doubled while my income went away and I had to file chap 7.

I am no longer trading and am on unemployment for reasons stated above (at least I am debt free thanks to Chap 7), so what you do to the rest of the US Retail Forex Community is no skin off my nose.

But I would suggest before you destroy any more livelihoods you might want to take a look at what has happened to those of us who were not abusing or mis-using the Retail Forex Instrument in the process of making our living.

Does any one there actually trade for a living?

You took away hedging and gave us infinite risk.

You took away Stop losses and take profits and gave us no definitive control.

You gave us FIFO and took away our flexibility.

If you take away what little margin edge is left, you will leave no incentive at all.

In the US 4x chat rooms and on the US 4x forums where the din of interaction was once overwhelming (a good thing), there is now only silence. You have killed an industry with your protectionism as far as I can see.

I don't know why you even bother to call it retail forex any more as that animal is now extinct.

Just some food for thought before you sign this new regulation into law.

Sincerely

Will Weaver,  
An ex US 4xTrader.

**From:** Jason Guidry <jguidry@mac.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 9:51 PM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Cc:** jguidry@mac.com  
**Subject:** Regulation of Retail Forex

---

RIN 3038-AC61

From: Jason Guidry in Houston, Texas

Dear Secretary,

I am a retail forex trader who resides in USA and currently trade with a registered NFA broker. I want to express my complete and total disagreement with the new proposed changes in forex leverage from 100:1 to 10:1. I trade forex for a living and have done so for over 10 years now. I have never, not once, blown/lost my account balance, as a matter of fact I have made money consistently. I've done so mainly because of leverage! Because of 100: 1 leverage I was able to trade enough "lots" to actually make enough money to live on. Anything lower than 100: 1 leverage would not allow me to do this! 10: 1 leverage is insane for small time traders like myself.

I really like my USA NFA broker and desire to stay with them however if leverage is lowered below 100: 1 I will be forced to move to an unregulated USA broker, either here in USA or overseas. Not only myself but many others too! That is not a good thing but again we will be forced to do so.

Please reconsider the new proposed leverage rule and leave it as it currently is, 100: 1.

Thank you,  
Jason Guidry  
Houston, TX

--

This mail was sent via IB Coalition <http://ibcoalition.org/take-action/>

**From:** The Barringers <ccbarringer@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 9:56 PM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Cc:** cftcfeedback@fxdd.com  
**Subject:** Regulation of Retail Forex

---

Mr. David Stawick, Secretary  
Commodity Futures Trading Commission

Dear Sir:

I am writing to object to a reduction in leverage as now exists in the forex retail market, as being considered in **RIN 3038-AC61**. I am a small trader and would probably be denied the privilege of trading should the proposed changes be made. The changes will only reinforce the strength of the "big dogs" who will not even notice our absence and will continue to line their pockets using our money when we can't even get in. Hold off considering changes until new banking controls are considered in Congress. They could change the financial environment in a way which might make changes that effect the small trader differently than are presently being proposed.

Leave the present rules alone, particularly the rules pertaining to margins. Don't drive us off-shore where we can continue trading with relatively small accounts which now pay our food bills since the huge stock market plummet under the past Administration. We are still recovering and Forex is helping our survival.

Don't rush into changes that will hurt the small trader and be just one more step to strengthen the big guys to the detriment of the middle-class guy. Thank you.

Sincerely,  
Charles E. Barringer

---

Hotmail: Trusted email with Microsoft's powerful SPAM protection. [Sign up now.](#)



**From:** jdm\_gankhuyag@yahoo.com  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 10:12 PM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:** Public Comment Form

---

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by  
(jdm\_gankhuyag@yahoo.com) on Sunday, March 21, 2010 at 22:11:56  
-----

commenter\_subject: Regulation of Retail Forex

commenter\_frdate: January 20, 2010

commenter\_frpage: 3282

commenter\_comments:

Comments Regarding this Issue:

I donâ€™t agree with this drastic change in the  
leverage for on-exchange traded currency contracts.

commenter\_name: Gankhuyag Jiidiimaa

commenter\_city: Ulaanbaatar

commenter\_state: Ulaanbaatar

commenter\_zip: 976

commenter\_fax: 976-324697

commenter\_phone: 976-99017220

-----

**From:** The Barringers <ccbarringer@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 10:17 PM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Cc:** cftcfeedback@fxdd.com  
**Subject:** Regulation of Retail forex

---

Gentlemen,

I am writing with my views regarding your proposed changes in the Retail Forex Market by the CFTC.

If the CFTC adopt their proposed new rules I think it would have a disastrous effect on the retail trader for the following reasons:

1. Funded accounts currently in the US would be expected to go offshore.
2. Forex fraud may worsen. Unregulated dealers from around the world will thrive, while operating without requirements for capital adequacy, risk management models, dealing practices or returning customers money.
3. The United States would undoubtedly cost itself millions of dollars in trade.
4. With the unemployment already high and job creation not likely to improve anytime soon. Thousands of white collar jobs will be lost that require advanced education and a range from software developers to foreign exchange dealers, broker employees and good educational facilities now beginning to appear to train traders, instead of them stumbling in the dark while at the mercy of trying to learn this trade on their own.
5. Lowering the leverage will wipe out large numbers of individual small retail traders that do not have the capital necessary to trade in stocks for example, but are able with small accounts to gradually build up their capital to become an experienced trader.
6. Frankly the CFTC is wasting their time with the little guys, who are a drop in the ocean compared to what Wall Street is doing. Why don't you go after the real problem the corruption and greed on Wall Street. But then I forgot this is Capitalism kill the little guys and give the big corporations and Wall Street free range to devour everything in their path.

I hope you will give very careful consideration to this decision you are about to make.

Identification number RIN3038-AC61

Yours sincerely,

Carmen Barringer

---

Hotmail: Trusted email with Microsoft's powerful SPAM protection. [Sign up now.](#)

**From:** The Snapp's <liquidgold@mindspring.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 10:26 PM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:** Regulation of Retail Forex

---

To: David Stawick, Secretary, and CFTC Policy Makers,  
From: Deborah Snapp  
Re: Regulation of Retail Forex - RIN 3038-AC61  
Subject: **Opposition to 10:1 leverage. Leave leverage maximum at 100:1 or greater.**

Dear CFTC,

These comments are in response to your proposed rule changes in the Regulation of Retail Forex, RIN 3038-AC61. Although, many of your proposed changes are very well thought out and will be helpful in reducing fraud in the Retail Forex Market (examples: broker registration, regulation of marketing standards, and increased dealer capital requirements), there is one area of the proposed changes that I oppose. That is the area of reducing leverage to 10:1. I believe in regulation and the enforcement of that regulation, but I also believe that consideration of regulation changes and their unintended consequences must be seriously considered.

I have traded Retail Forex for six years and spent several of those years in research, study, seminars, webinars, and practice accounts, while learning to trade currency as my primary method of earning a living. I am fully aware of the risks involved in trading. If this 10:1 leverage is imposed, my trading will be negatively impacted and my ability to earn a living in currencies will vanish in the. I would have to put more funds at risk to trade.

**Below is a partial list of the reasons I oppose the 10:1 leverage limit:**

1. Retail Forex has operated as basically a decentralized market and done amazingly well by Broker Self-Regulation, especially as compared to the other financial markets in the U.S. over the last 2 years, that were highly regulated and on exchanges.
2. The NFA has already reviewed leverage and reduced it to 100:1 for major currency pairs in November 2009. This level has been determined by the National Futures Association, Brokers and U.S. traders as an acceptable level of leverage and risk. The recent reduction to 100:1 from higher levels is an adjustment many U.S. traders are still adjusting to.
3. The proposed 10:1 leverage will "shut out of the market" many experienced and

knowledgeable small traders. Please consider leaving the leverage as the NFA has implemented and simply require more new account training and proper disclosure forms regarding leverage risks on all Retail Forex accounts. Education is the answer, not restricting what people can and can not do with their investment decisions.

4. Since many Retail Forex Brokers around the world offer greater leverage and some even more protection of the clients funds than in the U.S., more money will be directed out of the U.S. and traders will simply trade offshore. U.S. jobs will be lost at a time that the national unemployment is near 10%. Brokers will leave the U.S. as their client bases dwindle. Many high paying jobs will be lost in the U.S.

5. Future jobs will be lost. The Retail Forex market is growing in many parts of the world and many of those traders would have opened accounts in the U.S. but not if the Brokers have all gone out of business and become uncompetitive in the world market. This 10:1 leverage is anti-competitive.

6. Most of the fraud you are looking to save the retail trader from is caused by con-men and deceptive advertising. Registration as proposed will help reduce this fraud. The 10:1 leverage will not affect fraud and eliminates the traders.

7. You will be increasing the retail traders risk by requiring maximum 10:1 leverage of experienced and reasonable traders to deposit more funds with broker entities for trading. These broker entities (FDM's/RFED) are not required to maintain our funds in segregated accounts and the client funds are not protected under U.S. Bankruptcy laws. So changing to 10:1 leverage actually increases the client/retail trader's risk. Refco retail forex accounts are a prime example.

8. Removes the freedom and ability of the individual trader to choose the desired risk and affects the trading of the trader.

It also impacts the trader that uses higher leverage as a significant factor in their trading strategy.

9. If this 10:1 leverage goes into effect, the run off of U.S. trader accounts, will overnight put U.S. Retail Forex Brokers into Bankruptcy as all the account holders run to the exits asking for their accounts to be closed and funds returned. No doubt many will not be able to withdraw their funds in time, since it is unlikely that the Brokers can cover all accounts leaving at

once or even 90% of them leaving at once. This will be a regulation induced nightmare!

10. Congress did not intend for the CFTC to eliminate the U.S. Retail Forex Industry, but, merely, protect the client from fraud. If they had wanted to eliminate the industry they would have done so, but instead they authorized the CFTC to regulate, which means they intended for the industry to remain in operation. This 10:1 leverage will “kill” the U.S. Retail Forex Broker and Industry.

I ask you to please consider the points above and leave the leverage intact as it is and only consider regulation changes that make the Retail Forex industry safe of fraud. I encourage you to ask for proper disclosure, licensing, advertising and consider making the funds in the Retail Forex accounts segregated and 100% returnable to the account holder in the event of a broker bankruptcy.

Final Comment: If the 10:1 leverage goes into effect then all of the other proposed changes are irrelevant, since the Retail Forex Brokers will be out of business overnight and no regulation will be needed.

Thank you,

Deborah Snapp  
1614 NE 154<sup>th</sup> St.  
Vancouver, WA 98686  
360-597-4285

**From:** Alan Phua <alan.phua.8.4@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 10:30 PM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Cc:** alan.phua.8.4@gmail.com  
**Subject:** Regulation of Retail Forex

---

RIN 3038-AC61

From: Alan Phua in Singapore, Singapore

The new regulation to restrict independent IBs to one broker will not solve the problem of over speculation. Firms can still subscribe to different brokers and trade multiple accounts at the same time.

This new regulation regarding independent IBs will not solve the problem but only create frustrations for traders in the market that provide crucial liquidity.

Please consider taking away this rule. Thank you.

--

This mail was sent via IB Coalition <http://ibcoalition.org/take-action/>

**From:** Daryl Hendricks <dmhendricks@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 10:37 PM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:** Regulation of Retail Forex (RIN 3038-AC61)

---

Sirs,

Restricting leverage to 10:1 in retail forex is a poor policy choice. There will be several likely results-- 1) US forex traders will move their funds in rapid fashion to foreign trading firms, and 2) US forex trading firms will shut down or go bankrupt, hurting the firms, the employees of those firms and their customers.

Essentially, the question has to be asked--what principle is the CFTC proposing here? As long as there is transparency in a market, that market is very likely to operate in a fair and worthwhile fashion.

Indeed, the areas where the US and the global economy have suffered is precisely in those markets where there has been a lack of transparency; where the instruments were overly complex, and encouraged massive and wrong headed speculation. This is not the forex market. The rules are generally clear; the markets efficient and there is little evidence of traders or trading firms engaging in market manipulation.

I strongly urge the CFTC to focus on issues of maintaining market transparency and fairness rather than taking this draconian measure of changing the leverage rules--this will destroy both the market and the opportunity created by the market in the United States.

Daryl & Marcia Hendricks  
Philadelphia, PA

RIN 3038-AC61

**From:** David Moises Fajardo Zerpa <davidmoises@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 10:45 PM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:** 'Regulation of Retail Forex'

---

**RIN 3038-AC61**

**Dear CFTC,**

**I am writing to you to voice my opinion regarding the new proposed margin/leverage requirements for the retail forex trader. I believe the 10:1 proposed change is EXCESSIVE AND ELIMINATES MUCH OF THE OPPORTUNITY FOR 'ME' retail trader.**

**The retail trader that trades FOREX in my opinion is an informed investor trader that should be able to take advantage of the leverage the business allows, in this case 100:1**

**I believe as a retail trader I should be able to take advantage of leverage and not have legislation tell me what type of risk or leverage I should take on.**

**Thanks**



**From:** dan johnston <johnston3079@bellsouth.net>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 10:47 PM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:** Regulation of Retail Forex

---

Dear secretary,

With respect to **RIN 3038-AC61** and specifically **Regulation 5.9**, the passing thereof will make all the other well thought out regulations contained therein completely and purely academic.

I respectfully urge you to strongly reconsider this most damaging part of an otherwise pertinent and timely legislation.

Nothing less than freedom is at stake here.

Thank you so much for your time.

**From:** David & Elizabeth Stevens <stevensfamily890@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 11:14 PM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:** Regulation of Retail Forex

---

RIN 3038-AC61

Dear Secretary:

I am writing to you today to urge you to OPPOSE the forex market restrictions proposed by RIN 3038-AC61, specifically the 10:1 leverage requirement. Such a restriction would severely inhibit the ability of the U.S. forex market to compete with foreign markets. As you are aware, a 10:1 leverage would make it impossible for many current (and prospective) forex traders to do business. I myself am a relative newcomer to the forex trade. I have spent almost a year researching the various strategies and risks and am now prepared to enter the market. Unfortunately, the current restrictions contained in RIN 3038-AC61 would prevent me, and others like me, from doing so.

**Please reconsider the provisions of the RIN 3038-AC61. A 10:1 leverage would not only be detrimental to me, but would also bar the entire United States Forex community from being competitive with global competitors.**

Please reconsider the restrictions imposed on forex traders by RIN 3038-AC61 and eliminate or revise any provisions which threaten the viability of the U.S. forex trading market.

Sincerely,

David and Elizabeth Stevens

**From:** Alpha Theta <atheta@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 11:15 PM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:** Leverage of 10:1

---

I think that your ideas of controlling the leverage to 10 to one for retail forex is about the worst idea that the CFTC has ever been able to come up with. You people would be better served taking a couple steps backwards on this one and observing the rest of the worlds stance on this. Becasue if you regulate it to ten to one you will simply be sending a bunch of money out of the country. People are not going to stop trading FOREX!! They will simply close out their accounts in the USA and move to another country with the money. You should have noticed this with the FIFO rules.

Now if the CFTC continues with this please do the statistics of how much money leaves and then report it publicly. I believe the public outcry will be enormous. Thank you for your time and consideration realizing that I am but one small voice among the multitude.

Alpha Theta

**From:** tom <tomsebox777@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2010 11:57 PM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:** Regulation of Retail Forex--"No" to new 10:1 leverage proposal

---

CFTC/David Stawick,

Since the CFTC and the NFA continue to abuse their given authority I would like to say the following:

***"To all of the Forex Dealer Members (FDM's) in America.....please drop your registration with the CFTC and drop your membership with the NFA. They obviously don't have American Retail Forex's best interests at heart. I recommend that the Retail Forex FDM's form your own self regulatory organization like the NFA did for their futures and commodities interests."***

Why should forex even be regulated by futures and commodities agencies anyway??  
They don't regulate stocks do they??? Of course not.

Thus far, the NFA's Board of Directors and its legal and compliance team (Thomas W. Sexton, Edward Dasso and Lauren Brinati) have tried their best to ruin the Retail Forex arena starting with 2009's NFA Compliance Rule 2-43b. Then in November 2009 they and the CFTC took away 400:1 leverage and reduced it to 100:1 leverage. Now they want to reduce leverage down to 10:1??? Have they proposed this for futures, futures options and all of their commodity products? Nope, they didn't.....did they??.....so the next question is.....why the urgent need to reduce leverage again down to 10:1 since the 100:1 reduction in November 2009? What urgent matter happened in the last three months to bring about this 10:1 leverage proposal?

So in summary, let's take a look at the bad things the NFA and CFTC have done regulatory wise, to Retail Forex over the last year:

1-implemented NFA compliance rule 2-43b which took away the following:

- a.hedging ability\*
- b.ticket based trading
- c.ability to place stops and limits on individual trades
- d. Mandated FIFO offsets thus lessening the individuals ability to manage their account the way they want to

2-Took away 400:1 maximum leverage and reduced it to 100:1 in November of 2009.

3-Now the CFTC wants to reduce leverage down to 10:1 three months later.

\*Concerning hedging this is what the NFA said to the CFTC to get it approved:

***"The NFA is concerned that the customers employing this strategy do not understand either the lack of economic benefit or the financial costs involved...."***

To the NFA and the CFTC, I say....."Start concentrating on real issues that need to be dealt with like dealing desk transparency, or centralized dealing systems or offering SIPC like asset protections to investors and traders of futures, options, commodities and forex like they do in the Stock market instead of trying to micro manage our own accounts and thinking you know what is best for us. You don't know what is best for us! Leave account tools alone and concentrate on the real issues that could be improved

upon.

Right now the NFA and CFTC motives are to be questioned as it looks like you are trying to protect the futures and commodities markets by destroying/hindering Retail Forex. When they (CFTC/NFA) are asked the reasons of why they have made these changes over the last year, their answers are very questionable at best and carry no validity.

***So in summary, I ask all FDM's out there to opt out of your registrations and memberships with the CFTC and the NFA and form your own regulatory body.***

Shame on the CFTC and the NFA for abusing their given and entrusted authority. At one time it seemed like a good idea to join the NFA and get a registration #. I don't agree with that practice anymore. Most traders and FDM's are better off without their superfluous regulatory oversight.

The CFTC and NFA have definitely gone too far in the last year with their micro managing objectives and at the same time have totally missed the mark on what they should be focusing on.

Public comment

RIN3038-AC61